UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/078,051	02/15/2002	Pei-Yuan Zhou	50269-0516	6331

73066   7590   12/27/2007
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP/Yahoo! Inc.
2055 Gateway Place
Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1083

EXAMINER
LOFTUS, ANN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3692	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/078,051	ZHOU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ann Loftus	3692	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 September 2007</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-72</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-72</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>2/15/02</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

       1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

1.   This action is in response to an amendment filed on 9/28/07. Claims 1-72 are

pending. The application was filed 2/15/02 and a provisional was filed 2/17/01.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 9/28/07 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

The examiner notes that the applicant's arguments bring up a different approach

to addressing, in the discussion of the relevance of Liu. The applicant argues that in his

own invention as per claim 1, the participants know each other's addresses. The

examiner respectfully disagrees that this is evident in the claim. First, computer

messages make use of multiple addresses and aliases on various levels, such that a

participant may have many addresses, and a message can be sent by a participant in

ignorance of addresses such as an internal IP address or a MAC address. The claim

recites that the message is addressed, but that is not sufficient to conclude that the

participant knows the address. A message can be originated by a participant but

addressed by a machine without revealing any addresses to the participants. Second,

the verb "to address" has a broader yet reasonable interpretation as "to direct towards,"

as in "the speech was addressed to young people." A message can be addressed to its

recipient in this sense without having a physical address segment, and can be delivered

via broadcast. Alternatively, a message could be addressed to a relative or potential

customers, but carry the address of a router. The examiner finds that the phrase "the message is addressed" conveys sufficient metes and bounds as to enable determining whether or not a message is addressed to a participant.

The applicant argues that the assumptions behind Liu are contrary to the principle of operation of the applicant's invention. The examiner finds that Liu is relevant. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art of messages to turn a reference such as Liu because it addresses the same problem of recording interactions reflected in messages. Thus the reference would be reasonably pertinent to the problem, which is the standard in MPEP 2141.01(a).

The applicant argues that Liu does not teach the limitation: on said device, using said identity to maintain a log of the interaction between said first participant by said second participant wherein said interaction involves one or more messages sent by the first participant that are addressed to the second participant, and one or more messages sent by the second participant that are addressed to the first participant. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Liu teaches in paragraph 97 pages 9 and 10 generating communication records including the identities of the communicating parties. Thus Liu teaches using the identity to maintain a log of the interaction. Liu teaches communications between a first and second participant in paragraph 40 page 4. While the example here lists both voice and email, in paragraph 41 Liu teaches email and chat communications that would be more distinctly messages. It is implicit in the example that the messages are addressed to the participants. Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to use the identities to maintain a log of the interaction

between said first participant by said second participant wherein said interaction

involves one or more messages sent by the first participant that are addressed to the

second participant, and one or more messages sent by the second participant that are

addressed to the first participant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

US Patent Application 20020138331, filed on 5 Feb 2001 by Hosea et al in view of US

Patent Application 20020027901 filed 4 Sep 2001 (provisional 5 Sep 2000) by Liu et al.

As to claim 1 and 38, Hosea on page 4 paragraphs 36 –39, teaches a method for

communicating electronic information comprising the computer implemented steps of :

- Intercepting a message that has been sent from a first participant to a second

  participant prior to said message arriving at said second participant,

  - Wherein intercepting the message is performed by a device

    coupled between a plurality of clients and a plurality of servers, (a

    sniffer)

- wherein said message includes identifier information, (the
  information that allows correlation to a user profile)

- wherein said device has access to the message and can interpret
  the identifier information contained in the message

- Wherein said first participant is one of a service requestor and a
  service provider (the first participant has requested delivery of an
  HTML page)

- And on said device, determining the identity of the first participant based on said
  identifier information in said message. (extracting information used to correlate
  the request to a user profile)

Hosea does not specifically teach wherein the message is addressed to said
second participant and not to said device. Liu teaches wherein the message is
addressed to said second participant and not to said device in paragraph 40, wherein
Liu provides the example of fishing advice addressed to Participant C. It would have
been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify
Hosea to add wherein the message is addressed to said second participant and not to
the device in order to handle messages to people.

Hosea does not specifically teach using said identity to maintain a log of the
interaction between said first participant by said second participant and wherein said log
is based at least in part on reply messages that pass through said device. Liu teaches
in paragraph 97 pages 9 and 10 generating communication records including the
identities of the communicating parties. Thus Liu teaches using the identity to maintain

a log of the interaction. Liu teaches communications between a first and second

participant in paragraph 40 page 4. While the example here lists both voice and email,

in paragraph 41 Liu teaches email and chat communications that would be more

distinctly messages. It is implicit in the example that messages are addressed to the

participants. Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to use the identities to maintain a log of the interaction between

said first participant by said second participant wherein said interaction involves one or

more messages sent by the first participant that are addressed to the second

participant, and one or more messages sent by the second participant that are

addressed to the first participant. Liu teaches in the example (continued on page 5) that

some of the messages are replies (responding).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify Hosea to include using said identity to maintain a log of the

interaction between said first participant by said second participant and wherein said log

is based at least in part on reply messages that pass through said device in order to

have documentation of the device activity and a record of what it intercepted.

5.   Claims 2-7, 11-24, 26-28, 31-33, 39-42, 46-59, 61-63, and 66-68 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosea and Liu in view of US Patent

Application No. 20020133412 filed 6 March 1998 by Oliver et al.

As to claim 2, Hosea teaches identifying which services are being provided to

said clients by said servers based on the content of messages that pass through said

device on page 4 paragraph 37. Extracting the URL from the message reveals which services are requested. The Hosea Liu combination does not teach billing said clients for said services based on which services are being provided to said clients by said servers. Oliver teaches billing said clients for said services based on which services (pages) are being provided to said clients by said servers on page 5 paragraph 107. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu combination to add billing said clients for said services based on which services are being provided to said clients by said servers because services may have varying prices, and clients should only be charged for services provided.

As to claim 3, the Hosea Liu combination does not teach the device controlled by a first party, and the services provided by a set of second parties, and the first party performs the step of billing on behalf of the set of second parties. Oliver teaches the device controlled by a first party, and the services provided by a set of second parties, and the first party performs the step of billing on behalf of the set of second parties on page 1, paragraph 17. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu combination to add the device controlled by a first party, and the services provided by a set of second parties, and the first party performs the step of billing on behalf of the set of second parties because that way the device owner can sell billing services, and provide consolidated billing services for multiple second parties.

As to claims 4 and 39, Hosea does not specifically teach determining whether the message has billing implications, then generating the log, and using said log to charge a particular participant for a service indicated in the message, wherein said particular participant is one of said first participant and said second participant. Liu teaches using a log to charge for a service on page 5, paragraph 44. Oliver teaches determining whether the message has billing implications in paragraph 14 page 6 by checking the message for a token. Oliver teaches generating the log, and using said log to charge a particular participant for a service indicated in the message, wherein said particular participant is one of said first participant and said second participant in paragraphs 276 and 287, page 11, and 300 on page 12. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hosea-Liu combination to add determining whether the message has billing implications, then generating the log, and using said log to charge a particular participant for a service indicated in the message, wherein said particular participant is one of said first participant and said second participant because a log provides a recognized stable form of documentation to support billing.

The applicant pointed out that Oliver's logs are compilations of logs kept by providers. The examiner finds that the information in the logs is still based on information from the reply messages, before and after compilation. The log format (page 11 paragraph 277-page 12 paragraph 293) shows that the level of detail preserved in the log, including the message request URL, is based on the reply message and not generated independently by the providers.

As to claims 5 and 40, the Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach a log including a service requestor identification. Oliver teaches a log including a service requestor identification on page 11, paragraph 286. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hosea to add a log including a service requestor identification because it would be difficult to bill for a service without a record of the service requestor.

As to claims 6 and 41, the Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach a log including information to indicate how much the participant is willing to pay for the service. Oliver teaches a log including information to indicate how much the participant is willing to pay for the service on page 11 paragraph 287. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hosea to add a log including information to indicate how much the participant is willing to pay for the service because it allows error checking to make sure the price charged is within range.

As to claims 7 and 42, the Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach sending logs to an aggregation engine. Oliver teaches sending logs to an aggregation engine in paragraph 298, page 12. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hosea to add sending logs to an aggregation engine because it allows consolidated billing rather than a separate bill for each line item in the log.

As to claims 11 and 46, the Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach a message with a price at which the service provider is willing to provide a service. Oliver teaches a message with a price at which the service provider is willing to provide a

service in paragraph 302 page 12. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hosea Liu to add a message with a price at which the service provider is willing to provide a service because the vendor, the biller and the purchaser all need the price data, and each of them would have access to the data in the message.

As to claims 12 and 47, Hosea teaches proving content in the abstract.

As to claims 13, 14, 48, and 49 the Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach a service class. Oliver teaches a service class on page 5 paragraph 100. The service class determines where to direct said message and what service is provided. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hosea Liu to add a service class because certain classes of people, such as minors, need special treatment in non-cash transactions.

As to claims 15 and 50, the Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach updating a service requestor profile based on the service that is requested. In paragraph 333 page 14 Oliver teaches updating the service requestor profile (specifically credit(x) whish is in the profile) based on the service requested (specifically on its price.) It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu combination to add updating a service requestor profile based on the service that is requested because a record of services requested can help determine preferences which can be helpful in future transactions.

As to claims 16, 24, 51 and 59, the Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach decrementing (settling accounts) when the service requestor accesses the

service and the service requires a fee. Oliver teaches decrementing (settling accounts) when the service requestor accesses the service and the service requires a fee on paragraph 9 page 1 and paragraph 298 page 12. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu combination to add decrementing (settling accounts) when the service requestor accesses the service and the service requires a fee because if the accounts were not decremented, then no payment would be received for the services.

As to claims 17, and 52, Hosea teaches identifying which services are provided to clients by servers based on the message on page 4, paragraph 37.

As to claims 18 and 53, the Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach locating a profile based on the first participant. Oliver teaches locating a profile based on the first participant in paragraph 350, page 15. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu combination to add locating a profile based on the first participant because locating the profile allows access to all that is known about the participant, to help make credit and other decisions.

As to claims 19, 23, 54, and 58, Hosea does not teach storing billing data associated with the service requestor in the profile. Liu in claim 11 teaches storing billing data (address) associated with the service requestor in the profile. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hosea to add storing billing data associated with the service requestor in the profile because then it can be used for several transactions.

As to claims 20 and 55, the Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach determining a price that a service requestor will pay for a service from the profile. Oliver teaches pricing data in the profile in paragraph 256 and 257 page 10. This is used to determine a price that the service requestor will pay for a service. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu combination to add determining a price that a service requestor will pay for a service from the profile because any pricing data particular to that requestor would be in the profile.

As to claims 21 and 56, the Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach billing the service requestor if the profile indicates that the service requestor is to be billed. Oliver teaches that a home service provider bills the service requestor and other service providers bill the home service provider (abstract). Whether a particular service requestor should be billed by a service provider depends upon the profile field in paragraph 250, page 10. Thus Oliver teaches billing the service requestor if the profile indicates that the service requestor is to be billed. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu combination to add billing the service requestor if the profile indicates that the service requestor is to be billed because that allows the service provider to collect payment if payment is due.

As to claims 22 and 57, Hosea teaches in paragraph 39 on page 4 extracting a participant ID from a message and using it to locate a profile.

As to claims 26 and 61, Hosea teaches in paragraph 42 page 4 generating a profile by tracking surfing activity. Hosea does not teach billing. Oliver teaches billing based on services, such as those tracked in such a profile. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to store a number in the profile representing the number of times the service requestor has requested a service and increment it and store it back into the profile, and then determine whether to bill the service requestor for the service based on the number. This is a simple way to track the number of services requested, which helps the service provider determine volume.

As to claims 27 and 62, the Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach determining whether the service requestor is allowed access based on the profile. Oliver teaches determining whether the service requestor is allowed access based on the profile in paragraph 254, page 10. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu combination to add determining whether the service requestor is allowed access based on the profile because certain service requestors such as minors must be denied access to certain services.

As to claims 28 and 63, Hosea does not specifically teach that if the service requestor is not allowed access to the service, then sending the service requestor a second message indicating that the service requestor is not allowed access to the service. Liu teaches on page 12 paragraph 124, that if the service requestor is not allowed access to the service, then sending the service requestor a second message indicating that the service requestor is not allowed access to the service. It would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

the Hosea Liu combination to add that if the service requestor is not allowed access to

the service, then sending the service requestor a second message indicating that the

service requestor is not allowed access to the service because sending a message to

explain is cheaper than answering a customer service phone call.

As to claims 31, 33, 66 and 68, the Hosea Liu combination does not specifically

teach determining whether the service requestor has funds to pay for a service based

on an authorization source, which is in the profile. Oliver in paragraphs 329-333, page

14 teaches determining whether the service requestor has funds to pay for a service

based on an authorization source, which is in the profile. It would have been obvious to

a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu

combination to add determining whether the service requestor has funds to pay for a

service based on an authorization source, which is in the profile because it helps to

avoid non-payment of services.

As to claims 32 and 67, Hosea teaches retransmitting the message to the service

provider to obtain the service for the service requestor in Fig 9 and page 5 paragraph

45, where the HTML request for the content that originated from the user and was

intercepted is then retransmitted to the content provider to obtain the service/content.

The Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach causing funds to be

decremented from a requestor account associated with the service requestor. Oliver in

paragraph 330 teaches an account linked to a debit card. This would allow the funds to

be decremented from a requestor account associated with the service requestor. It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu combination to add causing funds to be decremented from a requestor account associated with the service requestor in order to allow real-time payment for services.

6.   Claims 8, 10, 43 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosea in view of Liu, and Oliver and further in view of US Patent No. 5339239 filed 11 Oct 1990 by Manabe et al.

As to claims 8 and 43, The Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach determining whether the particular participant has sufficient funds to pay for the service; and determining how to handle said message based on whether said particular participant has sufficient funds to pay for the service.   Oliver on page 14 paragraphs 329-332 teaches a credit(x) value that establishes funds available to the participant, compares credit(x) to the charge amount to determine sufficient funds and determines what to do next. Thus Oliver teaches determining whether the particular participant has sufficient funds to pay for the service; and determining how to handle said message based on whether said particular participant has sufficient funds to pay for the service. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu combination to add determining whether the particular participant has sufficient funds to pay for the service; and determining how to handle said message based on whether said particular participant has sufficient funds to pay for the service in order to avoid providing services without payment.

The Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach determining that the particular participant must pre-pay for the service. Manabe teaches in col 5 lines 33-42 determining that the particular participant must pre-pay for the service. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu Oliver combination to add determining that the particular participant must pre-pay for the service, because it would enable to sales to people without established credit to purchase the services.

As to claims 10 and 45, Manabe teaches determining that the service requestor must pre-pay for the service in col 5 lines 33-42 as above. The Hosea Liu Manabe combination does not specifically teach inspecting a requestor profile associated with the service requestor. Oliver teaches inspecting a requestor profile associated with the service requestor on page 14 paragraphs 329-332. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu Manabe combination to add inspecting a requestor profile associated with the service requestor in order to avoid extending credit to known deadbeats.

7.   Claims 9 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosea in view of Liu, and Oliver and Manabe, and US Patent No 6167385, filed 30 Nov 1998 by Hartley –Urquhart, hereafter called Hartley.

. As to claims 9 and 44, Oliver on page 14 paragraphs 329-332 teaches inspecting a profile for prepayment guidance as above. Manabe in col 5 lines 33-42 teaches determining that a service requestor must pre-pay for the service as above. The Hosea

Liu Oliver Manabe combination does not specifically teach a provider profile that with

prepayment guidance. Hartley in col 3 lines 49-64 teaches a provider profile with

prepayment guidance. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu Oliver Manabe combination to add a

provider profile with prepayment guidance, because by storing such information in a

provider file, it would only need to be updated in a single easily-found place when the

policy changes.

8.   Claims 25 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hosea in view of Liu and Oliver and further in view of US Patent No. 5502636 filed

Jan 31, 1992 by Clarke.

        As to claims 25 and 60, The Hosea Liu Oliver combination does not specifically

teach updating the profile to award the service requestor a prize for having requested

said service. Clarke in claims 6, 18 and 19 teaches updating the profile to award the

service requestor a prize (coupon) for having requested said service (subscription). It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the Hosea Liu Oliver combination to add updating the profile to

award the service requestor a prize for having requested said service because it helps

to motivate repeat business.

9.   Claims 29, 30, 64 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hosea in view of Liu and further in view of US Patent No. 6704612

filed 12 May 1999 by Hahn-Carlson, hereafter known as Hahn.

As to claims 29, 30, 64, and 65, Hosea teaches retransmitting the message to the

service provider to obtain the service for the service requestor in Fig 9 and page 5

paragraph 45, where the HTML request for the content that originated from the user and

was intercepted is then retransmitted to the content provider to obtain the

service/content. The Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach inspecting a

profile to determine whether the service requestor requires pre-authorization for the

service, and sending the service requestor a payment authorization message. Hahn

teaches inspecting a profile to determine whether the service requestor requires pre-

authorization for the service in claims 1, 11 and 16. Hahn teaches in col 11 line 45 to col

12 line 5 sending a payment authorization request and receiving a payment

authorization. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu combination to add inspecting a profile to

determine whether the service requestor requires pre-authorization for the service,

sending the service requestor a payment authorization message, and receiving a

payment authorization in order to document a purchaser's agreement to pay and avoid

denial of payment later.

10.   Claims 34, 35, 69 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hosea in view of Liu, and Oliver and US Patent No. 5960416 filed 9

Dec 1997 by Block.

As to claims 34 and 69, The Hosea Liu Oliver combination does not specifically

teach an authorization source as a billing system. Block teaches an authorization

source as a billing system in col 3 lines 13-16. It would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu Oliver

combination to add an authorization source as a billing system because customer

financial information is kept in billing systems.

As to claim 35 and 70, The Hosea Liu Oliver Block combination as defined so far

teaches authorization from a billing system, but does not specifically teach an

authorization from an access provider. Oliver, Figure 2, teaches a CSP, or Clickshare

Service Provider, that can be an ISP, or Internet Service Provider, which would be an

access provider. Oliver teaches on page 14 paragraph 330 that the CSP provides

credit(x) which is an authorization to spend up to the limit specified. Thus Oliver teaches

an authorization source as an access provider. It would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the Hosea Liu

Oliver Block combination to add an authorization source as an access provider because

an access provider such as an ISP already has a financial relationship with the service

requestor.

11.   Claims 36 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hosea in view of Liu, and US Patent Application No. 20010029482 filed 9 Mar

2001 (provisional 5 June 2000) by Tealdi et al.

As to claims 36 and 71, Hosea teaches retransmitting the message to the service

provider to obtain the service for the service requestor in Fig 9 and page 5 paragraph

45. The Hosea Liu combination does not specifically teach determining whether the

service provider is an authorized partner. Tealdi teaches determining whether a service

provider is an authorized partner (registered service provider) in page 12 paragraph

161. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to further modify the Hosea Liu Oliver combination to add the service provider

is an authorized partner because if they are not authorized partners they may

disapprove of the message interception.

12.   Claims 37 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hosea in view of Liu, and Tealdi further in view of Oliver.

As to claims 37 and 72, the Hosea Liu Tealdi combination does not specifically

teach a secure connection and authentication. Oliver teaches a secure connection and

authentication in paragraph 365, page 16. It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Hosea Liu Tealdi

combination to add a secure connection and authentication in order to avoid fraud.

Conclusion

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ann Loftus whose telephone number is 571-272-7342. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached on 571-272-6702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AL
12/14/07

KAMBIZ ABDI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER